

# EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING (EBDM) PRIMER

FOUNDATIONAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT  
A SERIES OF DOCUMENTS DEVELOPED UNDER  
THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS'  
EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING IN STATE  
AND LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS (EBDM)  
INITIATIVE

JUNE 2017

EBDM



Center for Effective Public Policy

This project was supported by Cooperative Agreement No. 12CS15GKM2 awarded by the National Institute of Corrections. The National Institute of Corrections is a component of the U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

© 2017 Center for Effective Public Policy. The National Institute of Corrections reserves the right to reproduce, publish, translate, or otherwise use, and to authorize others to publish and use, all or any part of the copyrighted material contained in this publication.

EBDM



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Primer Purpose .....	1
Introduction .....	2
The Rationale for Implementing Evidence-Based Policies and Practices in the Justice System .....	3
Appendix 1: Risk Assessment Tools .....	10
Appendix 2: The Evidence-Based Decision Making Initiative: A Roadmap for Phase II .....	13
Appendix 3: The Evidence-Based Decision Making Initiative: A Roadmap for Phase III .....	15
Appendix 4: The Evidence-Based Decision Making Initiative: A Roadmap for Phase IV .....	18
Glossary .....	20
References .....	24
Additional EBP and EBDM Resources .....	28

## PRIMER PURPOSE

This primer was developed to introduce criminal justice and allied professionals to evidence-based decision making. Evidence-based decision making is a strategic and deliberate method of considering empirical knowledge—that is, knowledge derived from methodologically sound research—and research-supported principles to decisions pertaining to the management of justice systems, justice system agencies, and justice-involved individuals.

The primer also aims to provide foundational information on the Evidence-Based Decision Making (EBDM) in State and Local Criminal Justice Systems Initiative—sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections—and to support a series of documents about EBDM, including:

- a set of case studies that highlight key accomplishments of the seven local jurisdictions that served as the EBDM pilot sites;
- a set of stakeholder briefs that describe the benefits and challenges of judges, prosecutors, defenders, pretrial executives, police and sheriffs, probation, victim service providers, and state/county legislators and administrators/commissioners participating in EBDM; and
- a set of user's guides that examine in greater depth the engagement of select disciplines (judges, prosecutors, defenders, pretrial executives, and victim service providers) in the EBDM process.

Finally, the primer guides readers to other resources supportive of EBDM principles and processes.

## INTRODUCTION

The EBDM initiative was established to harness the knowledge from a growing body of evidence that can inform justice system agencies' performance and increase effectiveness. It was also designed to address a lack of system collaboration around a common set of outcomes and principles. The EBDM initiative has constructed a framework under which all justice system stakeholders—working together—can consider the research and best practices from within and outside of the criminal justice system, in order to work toward the shared goal of fewer victims and safer communities.

## THE RATIONALE FOR IMPLEMENTING EVIDENCE-BASED POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Research reveals that by three years out, two-thirds of individuals released from prison are rearrested; by five years out, more than three-quarters are rearrested (Durose, Cooper, & Snyder, 2014). More than one in three (35%) probationers and more than one in ten (16%) parolees are sent to prison for committing new offenses or violating their conditions of supervision (Kaeble & Bonczar, 2016). Other research shows that low risk defendants who are held in jail pretrial, even for as little as 2 to 3 days, are more likely to be arrested before trial (Lowenkamp, VanNostrand, & Holsinger, 2013). Further, low risk defendants who are held in jail throughout the pretrial period are more likely to recidivate post-disposition than low risk defendants who are released pretrial (Lowenkamp et al., 2013). Despite these concerning statistics, there is hope for a future with safer communities. By using research to inform their approaches, criminal justice agencies can reduce recidivism, victimization, and the accelerating costs of maintaining costly corrections systems.

Studies on post-conviction populations examining the question of how best to prevent future crime point to seven key strategies:<sup>1</sup>

1. Use risk/needs assessment tools to identify offenders' risk to reoffend and their criminogenic needs (i.e., those traits that lead to future crime). Structured tools predict pretrial misconduct, institutional misconduct, and risk of reoffense more effectively than professional judgment alone (see, for example, Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2006; Bonta, 2007; Cadigan & Lowenkamp, 2011; Grove & Meehl, 1996; Grove, Zald, Lebow, Snitz, & Nelson, 2000; Makarios & Latessa, 2013). (For more information on risk/needs assessment, see Appendix 1.)
2. Direct programming and interventions to medium and higher risk offenders. Recidivism rates are reduced an average of 30% when medium and high risk offenders receive appropriate behavior-changing programming (see, for example, Andrews, 2007; Andrews & Bonta, 2007; Andrews & Dowden, 2007; Andrews, Dowden, & Gendreau, 1999; Dowden, 1998). Conversely, offenders assessed as low risk to reoffend do not benefit from behavior-changing programming and are slightly more likely to recidivate when they are overly supervised or programmed (see, for example, Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2004; Lowenkamp, Latessa, & Holsinger, 2006).
3. Focus interventions for medium and higher risk offenders on their individual criminogenic needs. Employing program interventions that influence the traits that lead to future crime yield stronger reductions in recidivism (up to an average of 30% reduction) (see, for example, Andrews, 2007; Andrews et al., 1990; Bonta et al., 2011; Smith, Gendreau, & Swartz, 2009). Further, the level of programming intensity or dosage should match offenders' risk levels

---

<sup>1</sup>For more information and a complete list of research supporting these strategies, see "7 Ways to Reduce Recidivism" in the [EBDM Framework](#).

(see, for example, Lipsey, Landenberger, & Wilson, 2007; Makarios, Sperber, & Latessa, 2014; Sperber, Latessa, & Makarios, 2013a, 2013b).

4. Respond to misconduct with swiftness, certainty, and proportionality. Swift, certain, and proportional actions that reflect disapproval of behavioral misconduct are more effective in reducing recidivism than actions that are disproportionate, delayed, or inconsistent (see, for example, Hawken & Kleiman, 2009; Paternoster, 2010; Paternoster et al., 1997; Taxman, Soule, & Gelb, 1999). Graduated sanctions (i.e., sanctions that increase in severity based on the number and nature of acts of misconduct) and the use of confinement as a sanction for technical violations may have the unintended effect of increasing noncompliance (see, for example, Drake & Aos, 2012; Wodahl, 2007).
5. Use incentives and positive reinforcement more than expressions of disapproval. Positive reinforcement should be provided at a rate of at least four reinforcers for every expression of disapproval (or sanction) (see, for example, Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Gendreau & Goggin, 1996; Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996). To be effective, incentives and rewards should be tailored to the individual; swiftly applied; applied generously initially, and tapered over time; and provided in a manner that encourages internalizing the intrinsic benefits of the behavior (see, for example, Bonta & Andrews, 2007; Hawken & Kleiman, 2009; Paternoster, 2010; Skinner, 1974).
6. Deliver services in natural environments (i.e., in settings in offenders' immediate surroundings that most closely resemble prosocial, supportive environments) rather than in residential or institutional surroundings, where possible. Although treatment services provided in structured environments have been demonstrated to be effective, services delivered in natural environments improve offenders' bonding to the prosocial community and are more effective in reducing recidivism (see, for example, Bales & Piquero, 2012; Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, Rooney, & McAnoy, 2002; Shapiro & Schwartz, 2001). Diversion programs with an intervention component can be effective in reducing recidivism as compared to the traditional forms of criminal justice processing (i.e., incarceration and probation) (see, for example, Loughran et al., 2009; Wilson & Hoge, 2013a, 2013b).
7. Pair sanctions with behavior change interventions that address offenders' criminogenic needs. Research demonstrates that sanctions without programming (e.g., electronic monitoring, intensive supervision, incarceration) do not contribute to reductions in reoffense rates (see, for example, Andrews, 2007; Drake & Aos, 2012; Gendreau, Goggin, & Cullen, 1999; Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Andrews, 2001; Lowenkamp et al., 2010; MacKenzie, 1997; MacKenzie et al., 1995; Petersilia, 1999). In fact, the use of incarceration can have an iatrogenic effect on individuals; increases in time served does not reduce, or may even increase, recidivism (see, for example, Meade, Steiner, Makarios, & Travis, 2012; Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau, 2002; Vito, Tewksbury, & Higgins, 2010; Wilson & Hoge, 2013a, 2013b).

The implementation of risk-reducing programs can have a profound social and fiscal impact on victims. According to calculations by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 2016,<sup>2</sup> supervision programs that focus on risk, need and responsivity for high and moderate risk offenders create a \$11,483 (in 2015 dollars) benefit to crime victims,<sup>3</sup> while programs, such as the Offender Reentry Community Safety (ORCS) program in Washington State, that provide case management and treatment for dangerously mentally ill offenders who are being released from prison into the community create a \$33,083 benefit to crime victims.

### Distinguishing EBDM from EBP

There is a key distinction between the concepts of EBP and EBDM. “Evidence-based decision making” (EBDM) is the practice of using research to inform decisions throughout the justice system. EBDM is distinguished from the use of evidence-based practices (EBP), which is the application of specific research findings to discrete practices. For instance, a judge’s use of a risk assessment tool to inform pretrial release decisions is an EBP; understanding the risk principle and applying it across decision points is EBDM.

**“To reach their full potential, evidence-based practices cannot simply be placed alongside past practice or through the piecemeal exchange of one past practice for a new one. Instead, an evidence-based decision making process—a systemic approach that uses research to inform decisions at all levels—offers the greatest promise for recidivism reduction and the potential for a tremendous return.”**

EBDM Framework, page 44

### The EBDM Initiative

In June 2008, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) launched the Evidence-Based Decision Making in Local Criminal Justice Systems Initiative. The EBDM initiative aims to build a system-wide framework (from arrest through final disposition and discharge) that will achieve measurable reductions in pretrial misconduct and post-conviction offending. It conceptualizes a criminal justice system guided by goals defined and shared by policymakers; decisions informed by research evidence; a system guided by collaborative policy development; and a commitment to ongoing data collection and analysis to determine whether the goals of the system are effectively achieved. While first developed for local-level implementation, the initiative has since been expanded and adapted to state-level decision making, and is now known as the Evidence-Based Decision Making in State and Local Criminal Justice Systems initiative.

**The EBDM initiative introduced the “One Less \_\_\_\_\_” campaign, which is a call to action for every individual who works in the justice system to work toward the ultimate goal of one million fewer victims each year. If just half of the 2.4 million justice system employees were to effectively apply evidence-based practices on just one case every year, resulting in one less offender with one less victim, that goal would be realized.**

<sup>2</sup> For the latest analysis by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy of the costs and benefits of specific adult criminal justice programs, visit <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost?topicId=2>.

<sup>3</sup> In WSIPP’s analysis, “crime victim” is defined as a person who would otherwise have been a victim of crime, had the crime not been averted (i.e., includes potential victims).

## The EBDM Framework

At the core of the Initiative is the resource *A Framework for Evidence-Based Decision Making in State and Local Criminal Justice Systems* (Center for Effective Public Policy, & The Carey Group, 2017). The EBDM Framework posits that risk reduction and harm reduction are fundamental—and attainable—goals when all stakeholders adhere to the Framework.

- **RISK REDUCTION** refers to the lessening of the likelihood, frequency, or severity of reoffense by known defendants/offenders.
- **HARM REDUCTION** refers to the decrease of the ill effects of crime. These include the direct impact of crime on victims, the effect of crime on neighborhoods and communities as a whole, and the impact of crime on families of offenders and offenders themselves.

The Framework outlines a set of principles for effectively implementing EBDM:

- **PRINCIPLE ONE:** The professional judgment of criminal justice system decision makers is enhanced when informed by evidence-based knowledge.
- **PRINCIPLE TWO:** Every interaction within the criminal justice system offers an opportunity to contribute to harm reduction.
- **PRINCIPLE THREE:** Systems achieve better outcomes when they operate collaboratively.
- **PRINCIPLE FOUR:** The criminal justice system will continually learn and improve when professionals make decisions based on the collection, analysis, and use of data and information.

The Framework also outlines a structure for effectively implementing EBDM. This structure includes a focus across the continuum of key **decision points** within the criminal justice system and emphasizes the importance of involving key **decision makers** and stakeholder groups in the process.

### EBDM DECISION POINTS

- Arrest decisions (cite, detain, divert, treat, release)
- Pretrial status decisions (release on recognizance, release on financial bond, release with supervision conditions, detain, respond to noncompliance, reassess supervision conditions)
- Diversion and deferred prosecution decisions
- Charging decisions (charge, dismiss)
- Plea decisions (plea terms)
- Sentencing decisions (sentence type, length, terms and conditions)
- Local and state institutional intervention decisions (security level, housing placement, behavior change interventions)
- Local and state institutional/parole release decisions (timing of release, conditions of release)
- Local and state reentry planning decisions
- Probation and parole intervention decisions (supervision level, supervision conditions, behavior change interventions)
- Community behavior change (treatment) interventions
- Noncompliance response decisions (level of response, accountability and behavior change responses)
- Jail and prison (or local and state) discharge from criminal justice system decisions (timing of discharge)

**EBDM KEY DECISION MAKERS AND STAKEHOLDER GROUPS AT THE LOCAL AND STATE LEVELS**

<b>Local Level</b>	<b>State Level</b>	
Law enforcement officials	The governor's office and cabinet	Directors of state behavioral health, health, employment, family services, housing, veterans affairs, financial assistance, and other agencies serving justice-involved individuals
Pretrial executives	State supreme court, judicial department, court rule-making authority, Administrative Office of the Courts	Families of offenders advocacy groups
Victim advocates	State legislators (chairs or representatives of standing or ad hoc judiciary, corrections, or sentencing committees; joint judiciary and budget committees)	Representatives of state criminal justice coordinating groups, advisory boards, sentencing commissions, criminal justice advocacy groups, and reform coalitions (e.g., mental health alliances)
Prosecutors	Office of the Attorney General	State defense counsel association
Defense attorneys	State defense bar	State judges' association
Jail administrators	State directors of corrections; probation and parole/community corrections	State prosecutors' association
Court administrators	State pretrial executive	State law enforcement (sheriff, police, jail administrators) association
Judges	Paroling authority	
Probation/parole/community corrections officials	Victim advocates	
City/county managers/commissioners		
Community representatives (e.g., civic leaders, members of faith-based organizations, service providers)		
Behavioral health and human service representatives		

**Pilot Testing the EBDM Framework**

Since the development of the Framework in 2010 (Phase I of the EBDM initiative), the EBDM Framework has been adopted by multiple local communities. Since 2015, it has been applied at the state level in three states and across 28 local jurisdictions in six states.

During Phase II, seven jurisdictions from across the country were competitively selected to implement the EBDM Framework: Mesa County, Colorado; Grant County, Indiana; Ramsey County, Minnesota; Yamhill County, Oregon; City of Charlottesville/County of Albemarle, Virginia; Eau Claire County, Wisconsin; and Milwaukee County, Wisconsin. NIC provided technical assistance to guide the sites through a series of steps in preparation for implementation. These steps, which were intended to establish processes and the infrastructure needed

to successfully implement EBDM, are outlined in a Roadmap for Phase II (see Appendix 2). Roadmap steps include assessing current policies and practices, determining methods to more effectively integrate research at key decision points, and developing work plans for the implementation of EBDM, among others. Once a state or local jurisdiction has successfully completed these steps, the result should be a clear, specific, and measurable plan for implementing the policy and practice changes that the policy team agrees will advance EBDM. At this point, the jurisdiction is well-positioned to begin implementing the change strategies that will support the achievement of the justice system's vision and goals under EBDM.

During Phase III, NIC provided support to EBDM sites in the successful implementation of critical change strategies, development of communication strategies, and measurement of data to track progress toward meeting systemwide goals. (See Appendix 3 for a Roadmap for Phase III.) Examples of change strategies implemented in the local sites include:

- employing and validating local pretrial risk assessment tools;
- implementing universal screening of pretrial defendants;
- adding or redesigning diversionary policies and practices and basing selection for diversion on risk reduction research and outcome-driven decisions;
- aligning interventions with individuals based upon their level of risk and criminogenic needs;
- implementing evidence-based approaches to specific offender populations (e.g., domestic violence, female offenders) throughout the criminal justice process; and
- implementing decision making guidelines to respond to violations of pretrial and post-sentence release conditions.

Starting in 2013, NIC shifted its focus to replicating the EBDM Framework on a statewide level (Phase IV) in order to demonstrate the value of its expansion beyond single, local jurisdictions. (See Appendix 4 for a Roadmap for Phase IV.) Project staff worked closely with planning teams in five states—Colorado, Indiana, Oregon, Virginia, and Wisconsin—to consider whether and how to expand their EBDM efforts beyond the original local teams to include additional local jurisdictions and state-level teams. Planning teams in these states conducted exploratory analyses of their policies, practices, and data capacity; took steps to gauge the level of interest in and understanding of EBDM across their state; and conducted EBDM awareness-building activities. As a result of these activities, each state identified the most strategic alignment of state and local partners to support the advancement of EBDM within their state.

---

## QUESTIONS FOR EBDM TEAMS

At the core of the EBDM process are the decisions reached by the collaborative team around questions such as the following:

- What do we hope to achieve?
- What does the research tell us about the most effective method of achieving this goal?
- How closely do our current practices adhere to these research findings?
- How effective is our current approach in meeting our goal?
- What can we do to bring our current policies and practices into greater alignment with the research and outcomes we strive to achieve?
- What must be done to implement these changes with the full assistance and support of all stakeholders?
- How and when will we evaluate the effectiveness of our change efforts?

---

In November 2014, Indiana, Virginia, and Wisconsin were selected, on a competitive basis, to work in partnership with NIC on Phase V of the initiative. The goal of Phase V was to advance criminal justice system outcomes throughout communities in the selected states. As in the previous phases, these jurisdictions received technical assistance from NIC and its partners to conduct a series of planning activities, with the goal of implementing systemwide change strategies to align local and state jurisdictions with one another and with the principles of EBDM.

The following 21 teams participated in Phase V of the EBDM initiative:

- Indiana: State EBDM policy team, Bartholomew County, Hamilton County, Hendricks County, Jefferson County, Porter County, Tipton County.
- Virginia: State EBDM policy team, Chesterfield/Colonial Heights, Norfolk, Petersburg, Prince William County/Manassas/Manassas Park, Richmond, Staunton/Augusta County/Waynesboro.
- Wisconsin: State EBDM policy team, Chippewa County, La Crosse County, Marathon County, Outagamie County, Rock County, Waukesha County.

In September 2016, NIC announced that it would continue to provide some level of support to each of the three Phase V states as they move to Phase VI and implement their action plans in accordance with the Phase VI Roadmap. In Indiana, NIC technical assistance will include a special focus on developing a high functioning pretrial justice system at the state and local levels.

## Conclusion

Evidence-based decision making holds great promise for achieving improved criminal justice outcomes, including reductions in pretrial misconduct and post-conviction offending, and fewer victims. Through its EBDM initiative, which posits risk and harm reduction as fundamental goals of the justice system, NIC has supported the implementation of the EBDM Framework in multiple jurisdictions across the country since 2010. Through EBDM, state and local leaders are engaging in collaborative and deliberate policymaking informed by empirical evidence, demonstrating that it is possible to implement consensus-built policy changes that reduce crime and victimization, without sacrificing offender accountability.

## APPENDIX 1: RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Actuarial instruments are widely used in a variety of fields, perhaps most commonly in the insurance industry to set premium levels for automobile, home, and life insurance. In the criminal justice field, these instruments are used to enhance decision making in both pre- and post-conviction settings. Instruments used for the pretrial population are referred to as “pretrial risk assessment tools” and are used to assess the likelihood of rearrest or failure to appear in court during the pretrial phase of the case, while instruments used for the post-conviction population are referred to as “risk/needs assessment tools” and are used to assess the likelihood of future criminal behavior and criminogenic needs. These instruments play a crucial role in helping justice system professionals make evidence-based, harm reduction decisions.

### What Is “Risk”?

“Risk” refers to the likelihood an individual will have a new criminal arrest and/or fail to appear in court during the pretrial period of the case, or the likelihood an individual will conduct future criminal behavior post-adjudication.

Research on post-conviction populations demonstrates that the likelihood of reoffense can be diminished if the level of intervention (supervision and programming) is matched to the assessed level of risk. This is referred to as the “risk principle” (Andrews, 2007; Andrews & Bonta, 2007; Andrews et al., 2006; Andrews & Dowden, 2007; Andrews et al., 1999; Bonta, 2007; Dowden, 1998; Gendreau, Goggin, & Little, 1996; Lipsey & Cullen, 2007). Research further demonstrates that the best outcomes with low risk clients are achieved by low levels of intervention. In fact, some research demonstrates that an overreliance on supervision or programming with the low risk population can actually increase their likelihood of reoffending (Andrews & Bonta, 2007; Cullen & Gendreau, 2000; Gendreau et al., 2001; Lowenkamp et al., 2006).

In contrast to research that demonstrates that individuals assessed as low risk to reoffend generally do not benefit from behavior-changing programming (Andrews & Bonta, 2007; Gendreau et al., 1996) and are slightly more likely to recidivate when they are overly supervised or programmed (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000; Latessa, Brusman Lovins, & Smith, 2010; Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2004), recidivism risk among medium and high risk individuals can be reduced on average by 30% when individuals receive appropriate behavior-changing programming (Andrews & Bonta, 2007; Gendreau et al., 1996).

While the risk principle was borne from a large body of research studies conducted on post-conviction populations, more recent studies on pretrial populations have supported the

### CRIMINOGENIC NEEDS/DYNAMIC RISK FACTORS

#### RISK FACTORS

- Antisocial cognition (thoughts and beliefs)
- Antisocial personality (coping/self-control skills)
- Antisocial associates/peers
- Family/marital
- Substance abuse
- Employment
- Education
- Leisure

relevance of the risk principle to pretrial release and detention decisions (Milgram, Holsinger, VanNostrand, & Alsdorf, 2015; VanNostrand & Keebler, 2009). Research demonstrates that detaining low and moderate risk defendants during the pretrial stage (even for just a few days) is correlated with higher rates of new criminal activity, both during the pretrial period and following disposition (Lowenkamp et al., 2013). Also, as the length of pretrial detention increases (up to 30 days), so does the recidivism rates for these defendants.

### What Is “Need”?

Criminogenic needs describe factors that, if addressed, have been demonstrated through research to reduce future criminal behavior (Andrews & Bonta, 2007). Addressing criminogenic needs in post-conviction populations through effective interventions is referred to as the “need principle” (Andrews, 2007; Andrews et al., 1990). The most influential criminogenic needs, or dynamic risk factors, among adults are antisocial attitudes/cognition (thoughts and beliefs); antisocial personality<sup>4</sup> (temperament issues such as coping skills); antisocial associates/peers; family/marital stressors; substance abuse; lack of employment/education stability/achievement; and lack of prosocial leisure activities. Among these, the most impactful are thoughts and beliefs, temperament, and peers.

Individuals involved in the justice system may present a variety of other conditions (“noncriminogenic needs”) such as anxiety and stress, mental illness, low self-esteem, and so on. At the present time, there is no research to suggest that targeting these conditions will significantly reduce recidivism (Andrews & Bonta, 2007). This is not to suggest that these conditions may not warrant attention in some fashion but, instead, that emphasizing these conditions over criminogenic factors can interfere with risk reducing efforts.

Research also demonstrates that the dosage and intensity with which criminogenic needs are addressed is relevant to successful outcomes (Carter & Sankovitz, 2014). Dosage is the amount (e.g., number of hours, intensity, period of time) of correctional interventions (such as programming or reporting requirements) that are imposed. In the same way that patients who receive too little or too much medicine may not respond to treatment and regain their health, offenders who are targeted for too little intervention or too much intervention may fail to achieve the kind of behavioral change necessary to reduce their recidivism risk.

If needs are addressed effectively and the dosage of intervention is matched to the individual’s risk level, research indicates that there is a greater likelihood that the individual will not recidivate. Recidivism is further reduced when multiple criminogenic needs are addressed (Andrews & Bonta, 2007; Andrews et al., 1999; Dowden, 1998). That is, intervention strategies that address four to six criminogenic needs have significantly better outcomes than those that target only one to three (Andrews & Bonta, 2007). Furthermore, by focusing on the most significant among these criminogenic needs, the most significant results can be achieved.

---

<sup>4</sup>This term should be distinguished from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) classification of “antisocial personality,” which has a significantly different meaning and set of criteria.

## What Are Pretrial Risk Assessment Tools? What Are Post-Adjudication Risk/Needs Assessment Tools?

Pretrial risk assessment tools assess defendants' risk (during the pretrial phase of the case only) of rearrest and/or non-appearance in court (i.e., they do not measure criminogenic needs). Rearrest and failure to appear are the two factors a court can lawfully consider when making a decision to release during the pretrial phase of a case, and when deciding on bail/pretrial release conditions. As such, pretrial risk assessment tools have a different purpose—and differing factors—than do post-adjudication risk/needs assessment tools.

In contrast to pretrial risk assessment tools, post-adjudication risk/needs assessment tools assess offenders' long-term risk for recidivism and inform decisions about the types and intensity of interventions that are most likely to reduce the likelihood of reoffense risk. These tools include an analysis of static (unchangeable) factors (e.g., prior criminal record, current age) and dynamic (changeable) factors (e.g., attitude, use of substances, family/marital situation, coping skills). Post-adjudication assessment tools that are based on static factors alone may be referred to as “risk assessments” rather than “risk/needs assessments” and do not have a “needs” (dynamic factors) component.

Tools designed to assess short-term pretrial public safety and failure to appear risk, and those designed to assess long-term recidivism risk, can be administered by conducting face-to-face, structured interviews and asking an established set of questions (designed to accurately answer the assessment questions, meet statutory requirements, and/or obtain information pertinent to supervision-related decisions). Some assessment questions are designed so they can determine risk without an interview. Portions of the data collected are typically verified through collateral means (e.g., reported criminal history is confirmed through a records review).

Assessment tool factors are weighted based on research that correlates each item to the outcome measure of interest (i.e., new criminal arrest, new criminal behavior, failure to appear). An overall score is generated and results in a risk category classification (e.g., “medium risk”). This classification, along with the information collected about the individual's needs, are not intended to determine culpability (guilt or innocence) or degree of harm to the community. Like any actuarial tool, pretrial risk assessment tools and post-adjudication risk/needs assessment tools are effective in their general predictive qualities, but they cannot predict the behavior of any specific individual. By way of example, actuarial tools are used by the health insurance industry to calculate risk and determine annual premiums (which generally increase with age and a higher risk of disease); however, actuarial tables cannot predict with 100% accuracy that a teenager will not develop leukemia. Researchers continue to conduct studies evaluating risk factors; as such, new information will continue to inform the development, refinement, and use of risk assessments across criminal justice system decision points.

## APPENDIX 2: THE EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING INITIATIVE: A ROADMAP FOR PHASE II

### Preparing to Implement the EBDM Framework within Local Jurisdictions

Core Activities	Likely Action Steps (Others may be added, where needed)	By the end of Phase II, a site will have...
Build a genuine, collaborative policy team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administer a policy team collaboration survey (one or more times)</li> <li>• Establish ground rules and operating norms</li> <li>• Develop a shared vision statement</li> <li>• Articulate roles and responsibilities of team members</li> <li>• Develop “One Less” individual statements and a team document that reflects these statements</li> <li>• Take other steps to build/enhance the collaborative climate of the policy teams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A highly functioning collaborative policy team</li> <li>• A shared vision for the criminal justice system</li> <li>• A track record of meaningful team accomplishments</li> </ul>
Build individual agencies that are collaborative and in a state of readiness for change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administer an agency-based collaboration survey (one or more times)</li> <li>• Engage staff in the EBDM initiative in specific, purposeful ways (e.g., establish an internal working team to collect information, provide input, and assist in specific objectives)</li> <li>• Develop specific action items to address learnings from the survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agencies that demonstrate a collaborative climate and readiness for change</li> <li>• An engaged staff that provides meaningful, ongoing input into evidence-based policy and practice changes</li> </ul>
Understand current practice within each agency and across the system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a system map</li> <li>• Conduct policy/practice assessment around each decision point to determine the use of evidence-based practices/decision making and continuous quality improvement (CQI) competencies</li> <li>• Gather baseline data</li> <li>• Identify strengths/challenges and targets of change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A full understanding of the basis upon which decisions are made at key points within and across agencies</li> <li>• A set of agreed-upon strengths</li> <li>• A set of agreed-upon targets for change</li> </ul>
Understand and have the capacity to implement evidence-based practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administer a knowledge survey to the policy team and agency staff</li> <li>• Assess staff skills in core competency areas</li> <li>• Develop specific strategies to augment knowledge and competencies, where needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A common understanding of the research (and its limitations) across all relevant agencies/staff</li> <li>• An understanding of the implications of these findings for future policy and practice</li> </ul>
Develop logic models	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a system model</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sound and testable logic models at the system level</li> </ul>

Core Activities	Likely Action Steps (Others may be added, where needed)	By the end of Phase II, a site will have...
Establish performance measures, determine outcomes, and develop a system scorecard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree on key definitions (e.g., “recidivism,” “probation violation”)</li> <li>• Develop scorecard items/outcomes</li> <li>• Identify performance measures</li> <li>• Assess data system capacity/collection methods</li> <li>• Build capacity, where needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A set of agreed-upon performance measures that will enable an objective, empirical evaluation of the effectiveness of the justice system agencies in achieving their agreed vision</li> <li>• Benchmarks against which longer-term outcomes can be measured</li> <li>• Methods to collect and analyze data on an ongoing basis to inform policy and practice</li> <li>• A systemwide scorecard</li> </ul>
Engage and gain the support of a broader set of stakeholders and the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a public opinion survey</li> <li>• Compile information/a clear set of messages the team and individual stakeholders can use to inform and engage the community</li> <li>• Define the desired role of the community in justice system activities</li> <li>• Identify individuals/groups within the community who are appropriate for outreach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strategy for engaging additional stakeholders and the community in meaningful dialogue about the vision/goals of the justice system, the state of knowledge and research, and the system’s performance in achieving these goals</li> </ul>
Develop a strategic action plan for implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct an analysis of potential barriers to implementation</li> <li>• Develop a plan of action for implementing specific policy and practice changes—who, what, when, where, how</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear, specific, measurable plan for implementing policy and practice changes that advance evidence-based decision making and further support the achievement of the justice system’s vision and goals</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 3: THE EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING INITIATIVE: A ROADMAP FOR PHASE III

### Implementing the EBDM Framework within Local Jurisdictions

Core Activities	Likely Action Steps (Others may be added, where needed)	By the end of Phase III, the site will have...
Collect baseline data on implementation strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For each action strategy, clearly establish the impact of past practices (where possible)</li> <li>• Establish a post-implementation start date for measurement of impact of policy change initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A method to measure the impact of policy change initiatives against the impact of past practices</li> </ul>
Implement change strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize clear and specific implementation strategies for each change initiative</li> <li>• Establish a specific start date for each change initiative</li> <li>• Ensure all affected stakeholders are aware of the purpose(s) of the change initiatives, the implications of the changes, and the methods of measuring performance</li> <li>• Track implementation progress through the development of a “narrative of progress”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully implemented change strategies</li> <li>• Full stakeholder knowledge about and support of the change strategies</li> <li>• Documentation of the steps and impacts of the change process</li> </ul>
Sustain a multidisciplinary collaborative policy team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-administer policy team collaboration survey annually or bi-annually</li> <li>• Establish meeting schedule of sufficient duration and frequency to advance an EBDM justice system</li> <li>• Create a policy team meeting agenda template that includes, at a minimum, implementation progress updates, updated data dashboard, agency staff engagement efforts, and external communication activities</li> <li>• Periodically (at least bi-annually) conduct stakeholder analysis to determine if team composition should change</li> <li>• Develop a strategy for addressing attrition: method for identification and replacement of retired members, incorporation of new members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A highly functioning collaborative policy team</li> <li>• An institutionalized strategy for monitoring the team’s membership and level of collaboration</li> <li>• A documented process for integrating new members into the team</li> </ul>

Core Activities	Likely Action Steps (Others may be added, where needed)	By the end of Phase III, the site will have...
Fully engage agency staff in EBDM, focusing specifically on agency managers and supervisors, including non-governmental agencies (e.g., public and private defense bar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop agency-level logic models</li> <li>• Develop case-level logic models</li> <li>• Implement deliberate methods to communicate EBDM principles and change process/progress to agency staff</li> <li>• Intentionally engage agency managers/supervisors in the EBDM change process</li> <li>• Provide mentoring and coaching to agency staff</li> <li>• Develop continuous quality improvement measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All levels of agency staff aware of the policy team’s vision on an EBDM justice system and systemwide scorecard</li> <li>• All levels of agency staff able to articulate their role in advancing an EBDM justice system</li> <li>• Supervisors skilled in and conducting coaching and mentoring of line staff in EBDM</li> <li>• Documented methods of continuous quality improvement within each agency</li> </ul>
Embed EBDM knowledge systemwide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a strategy for identifying new, relevant research and processes for sharing relevant research across system</li> <li>• Administer/re-administer EBP knowledge survey</li> <li>• Consider conducting Principle Two assessment across agencies and/or make a plan based on assessments already conducted</li> <li>• Develop systemwide training agenda; deliver cross-training when possible</li> <li>• Use internal and external training resources deliberately to educate large groups of staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing mechanisms to assess staff knowledge and skills across agencies</li> <li>• Ongoing mechanisms to identify and disseminate relevant research</li> <li>• Ongoing mechanisms to build agency staff skills and knowledge</li> </ul>
Carry out the external stakeholder communication strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build partnerships with agency PIOs to assist in the delivery of the communication strategy</li> <li>• Conduct a local public opinion survey</li> <li>• Develop the key messages of the external communication strategy</li> <li>• Develop “elevator speech,” brochures, PowerPoints, and other marketing materials</li> <li>• Identify team spokespersons</li> <li>• Identify and target local opinion leaders</li> <li>• Educate and engage local journalists</li> <li>• Individualize key messages by stakeholder audience</li> <li>• Conduct strategic communication efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educated and engaged external stakeholders</li> <li>• A method of routine information exchange with external stakeholders</li> <li>• A baseline on public opinion</li> <li>• An array of communication materials</li> </ul>
Guard against implementation failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess vulnerability to implementation failure</li> <li>• Build specific strategies to ensure success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective information about implementation failure vulnerabilities</li> <li>• Successfully implemented change initiatives</li> </ul>

Core Activities	Likely Action Steps (Others may be added, where needed)	By the end of Phase III, the site will have...
Measure performance against systemwide scorecard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a data dashboard to collect routine information relevant to the systemwide scorecard</li> <li>• Review performance measurement data (outcomes) quarterly as a policy team</li> <li>• Share scorecard with staff/external stakeholders at least annually</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A method to routinely collect, analyze, and review data</li> <li>• Systemwide scorecard/outcome data</li> </ul>
Celebrate success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document activities and incremental achievements</li> <li>• Build a wall of accomplishments</li> <li>• Publicly acknowledge/display milestone achievements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A method of routinely documenting and sharing information about progress</li> <li>• An established practice of acknowledging and celebrating progress</li> </ul>
Institutionalize policy changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise system map to reflect changes in policy and practice</li> <li>• Develop new policies, rules, operations manuals, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documented and codified changes in policy and practice</li> </ul>
Expand the number of EBDM change strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engage agency staff in the identification of additional potential EBDM change strategies</li> <li>• Working as a policy team, identify the next set of priorities for EBDM change initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systemwide consensus on the next set of EBDM policy change strategies to be implemented</li> </ul>
Educate and engage in-state colleagues on EBDM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop or enhance an information-sharing strategy with discipline groups within the state</li> <li>• Develop an information sharing-strategy with state policymakers</li> <li>• Develop an information-sharing strategy with interested in-state county representatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local colleague communities, state policymakers, and discipline group representatives who are knowledgeable about EBDM and the Phase III sites' activities, progress, and documented outcomes</li> </ul>
Share experiences with national colleagues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participate in regional and national webinars, conferences, and peer-to-peer exchanges to share information about EBDM, its benefits, and local experiences and outcomes</li> <li>• Prepare case studies/vignettes on local EBDM experiences/outcomes</li> <li>• Publish articles in professional journals/e-newsletters</li> <li>• Working with representatives from the other EBDM sites, develop and carry out deliberate discipline-specific outreach strategies to national network of peers, focusing particularly on key opinion leaders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National colleagues who are knowledgeable about EBDM and the Phase III sites' activities, progress, and documented outcomes</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 4: THE EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING INITIATIVE: A ROADMAP FOR PHASE IV

### Expanding the EBDM Framework to the State Level and Additional Local Jurisdictions

Core Activities	Likely Action Steps (Others may be added, where needed)	By the end of Phase IV, the site will have...
Conduct awareness-building activities within the state	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct individual or large group meetings/trainings to facilitate the expansion of EBDM within the state</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local communities and state policymakers who are knowledgeable about EBDM, its goals, and the implications of the expansion effort</li> </ul>
Conduct a stakeholder analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify the thought leaders (organizations and individuals) in the state who influence criminal justice policy</li> <li>• Discuss how to engage and retain key stakeholder involvement in EBDM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key stakeholders engaged in EBDM and a strategy for engaging them</li> </ul>
Conduct and prepare a data capacity analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify the data that is currently collected that does or could inform criminal justice policy at the state and local levels, and where and how the data is collected, stored, and used</li> <li>• Collect and review current data-sharing protocols across state agencies and between state and local agencies</li> <li>• Determine the challenges associated with data collection, use, and sharing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A description of the current state of analytic support for expanding EBDM within the state</li> </ul>
Conduct and prepare a state-level criminal justice policy and practice analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a criminal justice <i>policy</i> analysis and identify (major) policy efforts that may influence EBDM</li> <li>• Conduct a criminal justice <i>practices</i> analysis and identify current (major) practices within the state that relate to prison admission and release</li> <li>• Conduct a criminal justice <i>initiatives</i> analysis and identify (major) efforts underway that may impact EBDM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A full understanding of the policies, practices, and initiatives that may favorably or unfavorably impact EBDM efforts in the state</li> </ul>

Core Activities	Likely Action Steps (Others may be added, where needed)	By the end of Phase IV, the site will have...
Develop a local jurisdiction matrix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine the level of interest in and understanding of EBDM among local jurisdictions in the state</li> <li>• Describe the nature of the state–local relationship</li> <li>• Identify key criminal justice structural arrangements that impact EBDM expansion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A description of local jurisdictions, their structure, their capacity, and the conditions that must be considered when determining the jurisdictions that will participate in a statewide EBDM effort</li> <li>• A description of issues pertinent to expansion of EBDM at the local level</li> <li>• A strategy for engaging select local jurisdictions in EBDM expansion efforts</li> <li>• A strategy for developing state/local/multi-jurisdictional partnerships</li> </ul>
Conduct a communications strategy analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze the systems and vehicles in place for communicating with criminal justice and allied policymakers and practitioners</li> <li>• Examine the systems and vehicles for communicating with the public at large</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An understanding of the current opportunities for and methods to communicate with policymakers, practitioners, and the public within the state about EBDM</li> </ul>
Develop Phase V application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the results from the various analyses conducted during Phase IV</li> <li>• Agree upon a process to select the local teams for Phase V and develop criteria for their selection</li> <li>• Make final selection decisions in regard to proposed state and local team members for Phase V</li> <li>• Discuss and agree upon the teams’ goals and outcomes for advancing EBDM in the state</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of state and local team members desiring to participate in Phase V</li> <li>• A set of agreed-upon goals for Phase V</li> <li>• A complete Phase V application that outlines the state’s goals for Phase V, identifies the state and local team members, describes the rationale for the selection of these teams and individual members, and describes how these partnerships will be established and maintained</li> </ul>
Identify capacity builders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify the individuals best positioned to serve as capacity builders who will support the expansion of EBDM within the state (with or without NIC technical assistance)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A team of up to six people from the state to participate in a “Capacity Builders” training from NIC</li> </ul>

## GLOSSARY

This abridged glossary defines key terms that are commonly used in the criminal justice field<sup>5</sup> and is adapted from a more comprehensive glossary that can be accessed through the [EBDM Starter Kit](#).

**COGNITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS:** Programs and services that aim to help offenders understand the relationship between their thoughts and beliefs, feelings, and behaviors, and to learn prosocial ways of thinking and behaving.

**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS:** The supervision of offenders in the resident population, as opposed to their confinement in secure correctional facilities. The main types of community corrections supervision are probation, parole, and pretrial. Community corrections is also referred to as community supervision.\*

**COST ANALYSIS:** A type of economic analysis that provides a complete accounting of the costs related to a given policy or program. Cost analysis offers the most rudimentary cost information required by both decision makers and practitioners, and also serves as the foundation of all other economic analyses.

**CRIMINOGENIC:** Attributes of offenders that are directly linked to criminal behavior, have predictive qualities (of a new offense), are dynamic or changeable in nature (such as employment and peer interaction), and therefore can be influenced through circumstances, programming, or changes in an offender's attitude.

**CRIMINOGENIC NEEDS:** Factors that, if addressed, have been demonstrated through research to reduce future criminal behavior. The most common criminogenic needs, or dynamic risk factors, are antisocial attitudes/cognition; antisocial personality; antisocial associates/peers; family/marital stressors; substance abuse; lack of employment/education stability/achievement; and lack of prosocial leisure activities.

**DATA:** A collection of observations or statistics used to measure and analyze interventions.

**DATA-DRIVEN:** The use of regular and ongoing data collection and analysis to track performance and inform policy and practice.

**DEFENDANT:** A person who has been formally charged with a crime.

**DIRECT EXPENDITURE:** All expenditures except those classified as intergovernmental. It includes "direct current expenditure" (salaries, wages, fees, and commissions and purchases of supplies, materials, and contractual services) and "capital outlays" (construction and purchase of equipment, land, and existing structures). Capital outlays are included for the year when the direct expenditure is made, regardless of how the funds are raised (for example, by bond issue) or when they are paid back.\*

---

<sup>5</sup> Definitions noted with an asterisk (\*) are drawn in whole or in part from BJS's terms and definitions: <http://bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tda>.

**EVIDENCE:** Can refer to items collected at a crime scene, eyewitness accounts, or security camera footage. These types of evidence are referred to as “legal evidence.” For the purposes of the EBDM initiative, however, the term “evidence” is used to describe findings from empirically sound social science research. The initiative refers to the results of this research as “evidence-based policy and practice.”

**EVIDENCE-BASED:** Conclusions drawn from rigorous research studies that have been replicated numerous times with defined, measurable outcomes about the effectiveness of an intervention or process.

**EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING (EBDM):** A disciplined approach to using data and research to inform and guide decision making across the justice system.

**EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES (EBP):** Discrete policies, practices, and/or interventions that are supported by research.

**FAILURE TO APPEAR:** A defendant’s absence for a scheduled court hearing when the defendant was notified in advance and deemed able to attend the hearing (e.g., the defendant’s absence was not a result of being held in confinement and not transported from jail to the hearing, being hospitalized, etc.); “absence” from the hearing is defined as having not attended at all while court is in session (vs. late for the hearing).

**GOAL:** The desired long-term result of an effort.

**HARM REDUCTION:** The decrease in the ill effects of crime experienced by all involved parties. These include direct victims of crime, nearby citizens, communities as a whole, families of offenders, and offenders themselves.

**INCARCERATED POPULATION:** The population of inmates confined in a prison or a jail. This may also include populations in halfway houses, boot camps, weekend residential programs, and other facilities in which individuals are confined overnight.\*

**INSTITUTIONAL CORRECTIONS:** Secure correctional facilities. There are many different types of correctional facilities, operated by different government entities. Local jails are operated by county or municipal authorities, and typically hold offenders for short periods, ranging from a single day to a year. Prisons serve as long-term confinement facilities and are usually administered by the 50 state governments and the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Private correctional facilities also operate under contracts for a wide variety of local, state, and federal agencies. Other correctional facilities are operated by special jurisdictions, such as the U.S. Armed Forces, U.S. territories, and federal agencies such as Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE).\*

**INTANGIBLE COSTS:** Costs that cannot be measured directly in dollar terms. Examples of intangible costs include pain and suffering and lost confidence in the justice system.

**JURISDICTION:** A unit of government or the legal authority to exercise governmental power. In corrections, it refers to the government (state, federal, local, or tribal) that has legal authority over an inmate. Prisoners under a given state’s jurisdiction may be housed in another state or local correctional facility.\*

**OBJECTIVE:** Measurable, short-term indicators or benchmarks that indicate that progress toward a goal is being made.

**OFFENDER:** A person convicted of a criminal charge.

**OFFENSE:** An act or actions that constitute a violation of one or more criminal statutes. Such actions may result in an individual being charged and prosecuted, and result in a court disposition. Some offenses may not result in formal charges and may result instead in dropped charges, referral to a precharge diversion program, etc.

**OPERATIONAL CAPACITY:** The number of inmates that can be accommodated based on a facility’s size and space distribution, staff, existing programs, and services.\*

**PERFORMANCE MEASURE:** A quantifiable measure that is used to assess whether or not optimum performance is being achieved and to identify where adjustments in performance or strategy are necessary.

**RECIDIVISM:** A measure of failure of an individual or group of individuals who have been or are under criminal justice authority. Individuals who have been charged with any new offense in any jurisdiction that proceeds past a probable cause hearing are considered to have “recidivated” unless those individuals are subsequently determined to be “not guilty.”

**RESEARCH:** The systematic collection and analysis of data, using scientific methods, to study the effect of an intervention.

**RISK:** The likelihood of pretrial misconduct (e.g., new criminal arrests during the pretrial period and/or failure to appear in court) or reoffense post-adjudication. In most cases, risk to reoffend refers to the probability that a future crime will be committed by an individual as opposed to the severity of the crime itself.

**RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLS:** Tools that measure the risk that a defendant will engage in pretrial misconduct (i.e., that the defendant will have a new criminal arrest during the pretrial period and/or fail to appear in court) or the risk that an offender will engage in criminal activity post-adjudication (i.e., long-term recidivism).

**RISK/NEEDS ASSESSMENT:** An assessment process intended to assist criminal justice practitioners to identify the level of risk posed by an offender for reoffense, and to identify the factors (needs) that, if addressed, may lead to a reduction in the risk posed by the offender.

**RISK REDUCTION:** The lessening of the likelihood, frequency, or severity of reoffense by known defendants/offenders.

**TANGIBLE COSTS:** Costs that can be measured directly in dollar terms. Tangible costs to crime victims include medical expenses, property damage and loss, and lost wages.

**TECHNICAL VIOLATION:** A finding that an individual has not complied with a court-ordered condition (or, if this authority is delegated by the court to another entity such as pretrial justice or community supervision, a condition established by this entity) that does not constitute a new criminal offense. For the purposes of this definition, a finding of a positive (“dirty”) urine test is (or is not) considered evidence of the commission of a new criminal offense.

**VICTIM COSTS:** The monetary value of the physical, psychological, and financial harms experienced by crime victims. Victim costs typically include tangible and intangible costs.

**VICTIMIZATION:** The effect of a crime on an individual person or household. For personal crimes, the number of victimizations is equal to the number of victims involved. The number of victimizations may be greater than the number of incidents because more than one person may be victimized during an incident. For household crimes, each crime is assumed to involve a single victim, the affected household.\*

**VICTIMIZATION RATE:** A measure of the occurrence of victimizations among a specified population. For personal crimes, this is based on the number of victimizations per 1,000 residents age 12 or older. For household crimes, victimization rates are calculated using the number of incidents per 1,000 households.\*

**VIOLATION (ANY TYPE):** A finding that an individual has not complied with a court-ordered condition (or, if this authority is delegated by the court to another entity such as pretrial justice or community supervision, a condition established by this entity).

**VIOLATION (NEW CRIME):** A finding that an individual has not complied with court-ordered conditions of community release by being arrested for (or being found guilty of) the commission of a new crime that occurred after being placed on supervision.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, D. A. (2007). Principles of effective correctional programs. In L. L. Motiuk & R. C. Serin (Eds.), *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming*. Retrieved from Correctional Service Canada website: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/005/008/compendium/2000/index-eng.shtml>
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2007). *Risk-need-responsivity model for offender assessment and rehabilitation* (2007-06). Ottawa, Canada: Public Safety Canada.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). New Providence, NJ: LexisNexis Matthew Bender.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime and Delinquency*, *52*, 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128705281756>
- Andrews, D. A., & Dowden, C. (2007). The risk-need-responsivity model of assessment in human service and prevention and corrections crime prevention jurisprudence. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *49*, 439–464. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.49.4.439>
- Andrews, D. A., Dowden, C., & Gendreau, P. (1999). *Clinically relevant and psychologically informed approaches to reduced reoffending: A meta-analytic study of human service, risk, need, responsivity, and other concerns in justice contexts* (Unpublished manuscript). Ottawa, Canada: Carleton University.
- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, *28*, 369–404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1990.tb01330.x>
- Bales, W. D., & Piquero, A. R. (2012). Assessing the impact of imprisonment on recidivism. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *8*, 71–101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-011-9139-3>
- Bonta, J. (2007). Offender assessment: General issues and considerations. In L. L. Motiuk & R. C. Serin (Eds.), *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming*. Ottawa, Canada: Correctional Service Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/005/008/compendium/2000/index-eng.shtml>
- Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2007). *Risk-need-responsivity model for offender assessment and rehabilitation*. Retrieved from Public Safety Canada website: <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/rsk-nd-rspnsvty/rsk-nd-rspnsvty-eng.pdf>
- Bonta, J., Bourgon, G., Ruge, T., Scott, T.-L., Yessine, A. K., Gutierrez, L., & Li, J. (2011). An experimental demonstration of training probation officers in evidence-based community supervision. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *38*, 1127–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854811420678>
- Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., Rooney, J., & McAnoy, K. (2002). An outcome evaluation of a restorative justice alternative to incarceration. *Justice Review*, *5*, 319–338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580214772>
- Cadigan, T. P., & Lowenkamp, C. T. (2011). Implementing risk assessment in the federal pretrial services system. *Federal Probation*, *75*(2), 30–34. Retrieved from <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/publications/federal-probation-journal/federal-probation-journal-september-2011>
- Carter, M., & Sankovitz, R. J. (2014) *Dosage probation: Rethinking the structure of probation sentences*. Retrieved from National Institute of Corrections website: Retrieved from <http://nic.gov/library/027940>
- Center for Effective Public Policy & The Carey Group. (2017). *A framework for evidence-based decision making in state and local criminal justice systems* (4th ed.). Retrieved from <http://ebdmoneless.org/ebdm-framework/4thedition.pdf>
- Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (2000). Assessing correctional rehabilitation: Policy, practice, and prospects. In J. Horney (Ed.), *Criminal justice 2000: Policies, processes, and decisions of the criminal justice system*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

- Dowden, C. (1998). *A meta-analytic examination of the risk, need and responsivity principles and their importance within the rehabilitation debate*. Ottawa, Canada: Carleton University, Department of Psychology. Retrieved from <https://curve.carleton.ca/d453a97b-6cc9-4b72-8a13-50586b31b262>
- Drake, E. K., & Aos, S. (2012). *Confinement for technical violations of community supervision: Is there an effect on felony recidivism?* (Document No. 12-07-1201). Retrieved from Washington State Institute for Public Policy website: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/1106>
- Durose, M. R., Cooper, A. D., & Snyder, H. N. (2014). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010*. Retrieved from Bureau of Justice Statistics website: <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=4986>
- Gendreau, P., & Goggin, C. (1996). Principles of effective programming with offenders. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 8(3), 38–40.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Cullen, F. (1999). *The effects of prison sentences on recidivism*. Ottawa, ON: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., Cullen, F. T., & Andrews, D. (2001). The effects of community sanctions and incarceration on recidivism. In L. L. Motiuk & R. C. Serin (Eds.), *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming*. Retrieved from Correctional Service Canada website: <http://www.csc-ccc.gc.ca/005/008/compendium/2000/index-eng.shtml>
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Little, T. (1996). *Predicting adult offender recidivism: What works!* (1996-07). Ottawa, Canada: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works? *Criminology*, 34, 575–607. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1996.tb01220.x>
- Grove, W. M., & Meehl, P. E. (1996). Comparative efficiency of informal (subjective, impressionistic) and formal (mechanical, algorithmic) prediction procedures: The clinical–statistical controversy. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 2, 293–323. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8971.2.2.293>
- Grove, W. M., Zald, D. H., Lebow, B. S., Snitz, B. E., & Nelson, C. (2000). Clinical versus mechanical prediction: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Assessment*, 12, 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1040-3590.12.1.19>
- Hawken, A., & Kleiman, M. (2009). *Managing drug involved probationers with swift and certain sanctions: Evaluating Hawaii's HOPE* (NCJRS no. 229023). Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/229023.pdf>
- Kaeble, D. & Bonczar, T. P. (2016). *Probation and parole in the United States, 2015*. Retrieved from Bureau of Justice Statistics website: <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus15.pdf>
- Latessa, E. J., Brusman Lovins, L., & Smith, P. (2010). *Final report: Follow-up evaluation of Ohio's community-based correctional facility and halfway house programs – Outcome study*. Cincinnati, OH: Center for Criminal Justice Research.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Cullen, F. T. (2007). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: A review of systematic reviews. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3, 297–320. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.3.081806.112833>
- Lipsey, M. W., Landenberger, N.A., & Wilson, S. J. (2007). *Effects of cognitive-behavioral programs for criminal offenders* (Campbell Collaboration Systematic Reviews 2007-06). Retrieved from <https://www.campbellcollaboration.org/library/criminal-offenders-cognitive-behavioural-programmes.html>
- Loughran, T. A., Mulvey, E. P., Schubert, C. A., Fagan, J., Piquero, A. R., & Losoya, S. H. (2009). Estimating a dose-response relationship between length of stay and future recidivism in serious juvenile offenders. *Criminology*, 47, 699–740. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2009.00165.x>
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Flores, A. W., Holsinger, A. M., Makarios, M. D., & Latessa, E. J. (2010). Intensive supervision programs: Does program philosophy and the principles of effective intervention matter? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 368–375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.004>

- Lowenkamp, C., & Latessa, E. (2004). Understanding the risk principle: How and why correctional interventions can harm low-risk offenders. *Topics in Community Corrections, Annual Issue 2004: Assessment Issues for Managers*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. Retrieved from [https://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/ccjr/docs/articles/ticc04\\_final\\_complete.pdf](https://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/ccjr/docs/articles/ticc04_final_complete.pdf)
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J., & Holsinger, A. M. (2006). The risk principle in action: What have we learned from 13,676 offenders and 97 correctional programs? *Crime and Delinquency, 52*, 77–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128705281747>
- Lowenkamp, C., VanNostrand, M., & Holsinger, A. (2013). *The hidden costs of pretrial detention*. Retrieved from Laura and John Arnold Foundation website: [http://www.arnoldfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/LJAF\\_Report\\_hidden-costs\\_FNL.pdf](http://www.arnoldfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/LJAF_Report_hidden-costs_FNL.pdf)
- MacKenzie, D. L. (1997). Criminal justice and crime prevention. In L. W. Sherman, D. Gottfredson, D. MacKenzie, J. Eck, P. Reuter, & S. Bushway (Eds.), *Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising! A report to the United States Congress*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- MacKenzie, D. L., Brame, R., McDowall, D., & Souryal, C. (1995). Boot camp prisons and recidivism in eight states. *Criminology, 33*, 327–357. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1995.tb01181.x>
- Makarios, M., & Latessa, E. J. (2013). Developing a risk and needs assessment instrument for prison inmates. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 40*, 1449–1471. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854813496240>
- Makarios, M., Sperber, K. G., & Latessa, E. J. (2014). Treatment dosage and the risk principle: A refinement and extension. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 53*, 334–350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2014.922157>
- Meade, B., Steiner, B., Makarios, M., & Travis, L. (2012). Estimating a dose-response relationship between time served in prison and recidivism. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 50*, 525–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427812458928>
- Milgram, A., Holsinger, A.M., VanNostrand, M. & Alsdorf, M.W. (2015) Pretrial risk assessment: Improving public safety and fairness in pretrial decision making. *Federal Sentencing Reporter, 27*, 216–221. <https://doi.org/10.1525/fsr.2015.27.4.216>
- Paternoster, R. (2010). How much do we really know about criminal deterrence? *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 100*, 765–824. Retrieved from <http://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7363&context=jclc>
- Paternoster, R., Bachman, R., Brame, R., & Sherman, L. W. (1997). Do fair procedures matter? The effect of procedural justice on spouse assault. *Law & Society Review, 31*, 163–195. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3054098>
- Petersilia, J. (1999). A decade of experimenting with intermediate sanctions: What have we learned? *Perspectives, 23*, 39–44.
- Shapiro, C., & Schwartz, M. (2001). Coming home: Building on family connections. *Corrections Management Quarterly, 5*(3), 52–61.
- Skinner, B. F. (1974). *About behaviorism*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Smith, P., Gendreau, P., & Swartz, K. (2009). Validating the principles of effective intervention: A systematic review of the contributions of meta-analysis in the field of corrections. *Victims and Offenders, 4*, 148–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564880802612581>
- Smith, P., Goggin, C., & Gendreau, P. (2002). *The effects of prison sentences and intermediate sanctions on recidivism: General effects and individual differences*. Retrieved from Public Safety Canada website: <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/ffcts-prsn-sntnacs/index-en.aspx>
- Sperber, K. G., Latessa, E. J., & Makarios, M. D. (2013a). Establishing a risk-dosage research agenda: Implications for policy and practice. *Justice Research and Policy, 15*(1), 123–142. <https://doi.org/10.3818/jrp.15.1.2013.123>

Sperber, K. G., Latessa, E. J., & Makarios, M. D. (2013b). Examining the interaction between level of risk and dosage of treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *40*, 338–348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812451681>

Taxman, F., Soule, D., & Gelb, A. (1999). Graduated sanctions: Stepping into accountable systems and offenders. *Prison Journal*, *79*, 182–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885599079002004>

VanNostrand, M. & Keebler, G. (2009). *Pretrial risk assessment in the federal court*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Federal Detention Trustee. Retrieved from [http://www.pretrial.org/download/risk-assessment/Pretrial%20Risk%20Assessment%20in%20the%20Federal%20Court%20Final%20Report%20\(2009\).pdf](http://www.pretrial.org/download/risk-assessment/Pretrial%20Risk%20Assessment%20in%20the%20Federal%20Court%20Final%20Report%20(2009).pdf)

Vito, G. F., Tewksbury, R., & Higgins, G. E. (2010). Evaluation of Kentucky's early release initiative: Sentence commutations, public safety and recidivism. *Federal Probation*, *74*(3), 22–26. Retrieved from <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/publications/federal-probation-journal/federal-probation-journal-december-2010>

Wilson, H. A., & Hoge, R. D. (2013a). Diverting our attention to what works: Evaluating the effectiveness of a youth diversion program. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *11*, 313–331. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204012473132>

Wilson, H. A., & Hoge, R. D. (2013b). The effect of youth diversion programs on recidivism: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *40*, 497–518. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812451089>

Wodahl, E. J. (2007). *The efficacy of graduated sanctions in reducing technical violations among probationers and parolees: An evaluation of the Wyoming Department of Corrections' Intensive Supervision Program*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest.

## ADDITIONAL EBP AND EBDM RESOURCES

It is beyond the scope of this document to provide a comprehensive review of the literature on evidence-based practices or evidence-based decision making. Readers are encouraged to visit the EBDM Initiative websites (<http://info.nicic.gov/ebdm/> and <http://ebdmoneless.org/home>) and its accompanying materials, and explore other related resources, some of which are listed below.

### EBP Resources

- Coaching Packet: Implementing Evidence-Based Practices: [http://www.cepp.com/documents/implementing\\_evidence\\_based\\_practices.pdf](http://www.cepp.com/documents/implementing_evidence_based_practices.pdf)

### EBDM Initiative Resources

- NIC's EBDM Webpage: <http://nicic.gov/ebdm>
- Initiative Website: <http://ebdmoneless.org/>

Visit the above websites to view these and other resources:

- Framework for Evidence-Based Decision Making in State and Local Criminal Justice Systems (“the Framework”)
- EBDM Starter Kit
- EBDM Case Studies: Highlights from the Original Seven Pilot Sites
- Evidence-Based Decision Making Stakeholder Briefs
- Evidence-Based Decision Making User's Guides

### NIC Resources

The NIC library provides access to over 18,000 corrections-related resources, including training plans, research reports, program evaluations, and more. Visit <http://nicic.gov/library/>.

The NIC Information Center assists correctional policymakers, practitioners, elected officials, and others interested in corrections issues. Information Specialists who have professional experience in corrections provide expert research assistance with full access to materials in the NIC library collection. Specialists assist with locating and, in many cases, obtaining copies of this information at no charge. Contact the NIC Help Desk at <http://info.nicic.gov/>.

### Justice-Specific Resources

- Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice: <http://www.bjs.gov/>
- George Mason University's Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy: <http://cebcp.org>
- Justice Center, The Council of State Governments: <http://csgjusticecenter.org/>

- National Parole Resource Center: <http://nationalparoleresourcecenter.org/>
- National Reentry Resource Center: <http://csgjusticecenter.org/jc/category/reentry/nrrc/>
- National Resource Center on Justice Involved Women: <http://www.cjininvolvedwomen.org/>
- Pew Research Center, Criminal Justice: <http://www.pewresearch.org/topics/criminal-justice/>
- Pretrial Justice Institute Resources: <http://www.pretrial.org/solutions/>
- Transition from Jail to Community (TJC): <http://www.urban.org/projects/tjc/>
- Transition from Prison to Community Initiative: <http://nicic.gov/library/017520>
- Vera Institute of Justice Resources: <http://www.vera.org/resources>

### Research Websites

- The Campbell Collaboration, The Crime and Justice Coordinating Group (CCJG): [www.campbellcollaboration.org/crime\\_and\\_justice/](http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/crime_and_justice/)
- Center for the Study of the Prevention of Violence, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado Boulder, Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development: [www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/](http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/)
- Correctional Service Canada: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch-eng.shtml>
- National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs): <https://ncjrs.gov/>
- National Implementation Research Network: <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/>
- Stanford University, Evidence-Based Management: <http://www.evidence-basedmanagement.com/>
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's (SAMSHA's) National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP): [www.nrepp.samhsa.gov](http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov)
- Texas Christian University, Institute for Behavioral Research, Correctional Treatment Evaluations: <http://www.ibr.tcu.edu/>
- University of Cincinnati Center for Criminal Justice Research: <http://www.uc.edu/ccjr/reports.html>
- National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Crime Solutions: [www.crimesolutions.gov](http://www.crimesolutions.gov)
- Washington State Institute for Public Policy: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/>

## Collaboration

- Collaboration: A Training Curriculum to Enhance the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Teams: <http://www.collaborativejustice.org/docs/2005%20Collaboration%20Curriculum.pdf>
- Collaborative Justice Products: <http://www.collaborativejustice.org/products.htm>
- Getting It Right: Collaborative Problem Solving for Criminal Justice: <http://nicic.gov/library/019834>
- National Network of Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils (NNCJCC) Resources: <http://www.jmijustice.org/network-coordination/national-network-criminal-justice-coordinating-councils/national-network-criminal-justice-coordinating-councils-nncjcc-resources/>

# EBDM

